

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action of May 10, 2002. Reexamination, reconsideration, and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this First Response, claims 1-3 and 5-35 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12-18, and 20-29 are directly amended herein. Furthermore, claim 4 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 30-35 are newly added. It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application.

**Response to §102 Rejections**

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, e.g., *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma* (U.S. Patent No. 5,570,151) and by *Abreu* (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,393). Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows:

1. A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:

*a plurality of sensors* positioned adjacent to an eye of a user, said sensors *configured to detect a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user* and to transmit, in response to detections of said physiological responses by said sensors, signals indicative of said physiological responses; and

*a controller configured to receive said signals and to trigger an electronic device to perform a particular task based on whether each of said plurality of detected physiological responses occurs during a particular time period.* (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither *Terunuma* nor *Abreu* discloses at least the features of claim 1 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, *Terunuma* and *Abreu* are both inadequate for rejecting pending claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In this regard, *Terunuma* appears to disclose a camera that operates a shutter based on a sensor for detecting when a user winks. See Abstract. Further, *Terunuma* discloses that the shutter may be inadvertently activated due to unintended blinking when dust enters a photographer's eye. See col. 1, lines 15-45. However, *Terunuma* fails to disclose that the operation of the shutter may be based on other involuntary physiological responses. Thus, *Terunuma* fails to disclose "a *plurality* of sensors... configured to detect a *plurality of different involuntary physiological responses* of said user," as described by pending claim 1. (Emphasis added). Accordingly, *Terunuma* fails to at least disclose each feature of claim 1, as amended.

Furthermore, *Abreu* appears to disclose that various electronic devices may be controlled via sensors positioned adjacent to an eye of user. As an example, a sensor positioned adjacent to an eye of a user may be utilized to enable quadriplegic individuals to control devices by activating the sensor via eye movement. See Abstract and col. 19, lines 32-58. In another example, a sensor positioned adjacent to an eye of a user may be utilized to detect when a user's eyelid moves toward a closed position in order to activate an alarm for waking a dozing user. Col. 110, lines 52-65. However, in such examples, an electronic device appears to be controlled based on whether or not a particular physiological condition occurs. Moreover, *Abreu* fails to at least disclose a "plurality of sensors... configured to detect a *plurality of different involuntary physiological responses*" and a "controller configured to... trigger an electronic device to perform a particular task based on whether each of said plurality of detected physiological responses occurs during a particular time period," as described by claim 1. (Emphasis added). Accordingly, *Abreu* fails to disclose each feature of claim 1, as amended.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant asserts that neither *Terunuma* nor *Abreu* discloses each of the features of claim 1. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### **Claim 2**

Claim 2 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma* and by *Abreu*. Claim 2, as amended, reads as follows:

2. A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:

*a plurality of sensors* positioned adjacent to an eye of a user, said sensors *configured to detect a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses* of said user and to transmit, in response to detections of said physiological responses by said sensors, signals indicative of said physiological responses, *each of said signals indicative of a different one of said physiological responses*; and

*a controller configured to receive said signals and to determine a value indicative of an excitement level of said user based on each of said signals, said controller further configured to control an electronic device based on said value.* (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither *Terunuma* nor *Abreu* discloses at least the features of claim 2 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, *Terunuma* and *Abreu* are both inadequate for rejecting pending claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In this regard, as described above in the arguments for allowance of claim 1, *Terunuma* appears to disclose a camera that operates a shutter based on a sensor for detecting when a user winks, and *Terunuma* appears to disclose that the shutter may be inadvertently activated due to unintended blinking when dust enters a photographer's eye. However, *Terunuma* fails to disclose that the operation of the shutter may be based on other involuntary physiological responses. Thus, *Terunuma* fails to at least disclose "a *plurality* of sensors... configured to

detect a *plurality of different involuntary physiological responses* of said user,” as described by pending claim 2. (Emphasis added). Accordingly, *Terunuma* fails to disclose each feature of claim 2, as amended.

Furthermore, as described hereinabove in the arguments for allowance of pending claim 1, *Abreu* appears to disclose that various electronic devices may be controlled via sensors positioned adjacent to an eye of user. However, *Abreu* fails to at least disclose that a value “indicative of an excitement level” of a user is determined “based on each of” a plurality of signals in which “each of said signals (is) indicative of a different one of said physiological responses,” as described by claim 2. (Emphasis added). Accordingly, *Abreu* fails to disclose each feature of pending claim 2.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant asserts that neither *Terunuma* nor *Abreu* discloses each of the features of claim 2, as amended. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claim 2 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### Claims 3 and 5-9

Claims 3 and 5 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma*. Further, claim 7 presently stands rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as purportedly anticipated by *Terunuma*, and claims 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Abreu*. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claims 3 and 5-9 contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. Since claim 1 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 3 and 5-9 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, these dependent claims

recite patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make them allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of their base claim 1.

**Claim 10**

Claim 10 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Abreu*. Claim 10, as amended, reads as follows:

10. A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:

a sensor positioned adjacent to an eye of a user, said sensor configured to detect a physiological response of said user and to transmit, in response to a detection of said physiological response, a signal indicative of said physiological response; and

a controller configured to receive said signal and to control an electronic device based on said signal,

*wherein said sensor comprises a switch that is positioned within a path of movement of an eyelid of said user, said switch activated when said user blinks said eyelid.* (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Abreu* fails disclose at least the features of claim 10 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, *Abreu* is inadequate for rejecting pending claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In this regard, *Abreu* discloses “a contact device 806 having a sensor 808” for sensing “when the eye lids move towards a closed position.” See col. 110, lines 52-55, and FIG. 42A. Moreover, during operation, the eyelid of the user moves back and forth over the surface of the contact device 806. Furthermore, the sensor 808 appears to reside within the contact device 808, and the eyelid does not appear to contact the sensor 808 as the eyelid moves over the surface of the contact device 808. In this regard, rather than activating the sensor 808 by contacting the sensor 808 with the user’s eyelid, the sensor 808 is activated by pressure exerted on the contact device 808 by “the eye lid as the contact device moves up” in response to a movement of the eyelid toward a closed position. See col. 110, lines 54-60. Thus, there is

nothing in *Abreu* to indicate that the sensor 808 is “positioned within a path of movement of an eyelid,” as described by claim 10.

Further, *Abreu* discloses another sensor 400 mounted in a contact device 402. See, FIG. 27. However, the sensor 400, similar to the sensor 808 described above, appears to reside within the contact device 402 and appears to detect blinks via pressure exerted on the contact device 402 by an eyelid. See col. 103, lines 31-55. Thus, there is nothing to indicate that the sensor 402 is “positioned within a path of movement of an eyelid,” as described by claim 10.

*Abreu* also discloses various other sensors mounted in a contact device. See, e.g., FIGS. 32 and 33A-C. However, there is nothing in *Abreu* to indicate that such sensors are “positioned within a path of movement of an eyelid,” as described by claim 10.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that *Abreu* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 10 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### Claim 11

Claim 11 presently stands rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Abreu*. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claim 11 contains all features of its respective independent claim 10. Since claim 10 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 11 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, this dependent claim recites patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make its allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of its base claim 10.

### **Claim 12**

Claim 12 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Abreu*. However, claim 12, as amended, recites “a plurality of sensors... configured to detect a *plurality of different involuntary physiological responses* of said user” and a “controller configured to... trigger an electronic device to perform a particular task based on whether *each of said plurality of detected physiological responses occurs during a specified time period.*” (Emphasis added). For at least the reasons set forth hereinabove in the arguments for allowance of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Abreu* fails to disclose at least the foregoing features of claim 12. Therefore, the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### **Claim 14**

Claim 13 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Abreu*. However, claim 14, as amended, recites “wherein said sensor comprises a switch that is positioned *within a path of movement of an eyelid* of said user, said switch activated when said user blinks said eyelid.” (Emphasis added). For at least the reasons set forth hereinabove in the arguments for allowance of claim 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Abreu* fails to disclose at least the foregoing features of claim 14. Therefore, the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### Claim 15

Claim 15 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma* and by *Abreu*. However, claim 15, as amended, reads as follows:

15. A method for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:  
positioning a plurality of sensors adjacent to an eye of a user;  
detecting, via said sensors, a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user;  
*determining whether each of said different involuntary physiological responses is detected, via said detecting step, within a particular time period; and*  
*automatically triggering an electronic device to perform a particular task based on said determining step.* (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons set forth hereinabove in the arguments for allowance of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither *Terunuma* nor *Abreu* discloses at least the features of claim 15 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### Claim 16

Claim 16 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Abreu*. However, claim 16, as amended, reads as follows:

16. A method for controlling cameras based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:  
positioning a sensor adjacent to an eye of a user;  
detecting, via said sensor, a physiological response of said user; and  
*automatically controlling a camera based on said detecting step, wherein said sensor is coupled to a contact lens.* (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Abreu* failed to disclose at least the features of claim 16 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

In this regard, *Abreu* discloses a system for controlling various devices based on sensors for detecting winks of a user. However, *Abreu* fails to disclose the step of “controlling a camera based on” a detected “physiological response” of a user, as described by claim 16. (Emphasis added). Therefore, *Abreu* fails to disclose each feature of claim 16, as amended.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn

### Claims 17 and 19

Claim 17 presently stands rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma* and by *Abreu*. Furthermore, claim 19 presently stands rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma*. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claims 17 and 19 contain all features of their respective independent claim 15. Since claim 15 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 17 and 19 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, these dependent claims recite patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make them allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of their base claim 15.

### **Claim 18**

Claim 18 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma* and by *Abreu*. However, claim 18, as amended, reads as follows:

18. A method for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:  
positioning a plurality of sensors adjacent to an eye of a user;  
*detecting, via said sensors, a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user;*  
*determining a value indicative of an excitement level of said user based on each of said different involuntary responses detected via said detecting step,*  
*automatically controlling an electronic device based on said value determined in said determining step.* (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons set forth hereinabove in the arguments for allowance of claim 2, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither *Terunuma* nor *Abreu* discloses at least the features of claim 18 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

### **Claim 20**

Claim 20 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma*. However, claim 20, as amended, reads as follows:

20. A system, comprising:  
a camera;  
*a plurality of sensors, each of said sensors configured to detect a different physiological response of a user;* and  
a controller configured to cause said camera to capture an image based on detections of different physiological responses by each of said sensors. (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Terunuma* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 20 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 21, 22, and 24**

Claims 21, 22, and 24 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma*. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claims 21, 22, and 24 contain all features of their respective independent claim 20. Since claim 20 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 21, 22, and 24 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, these dependent claims recite patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make them allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of their base claim 20.

#### **Claim 25**

Claim 25 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma*. However, claim 25, as amended, reads as follows:

25. A method, comprising the steps of:  
providing a camera;  
*detecting, via a plurality of sensors, different physiological responses of a user of said camera;* and  
automatically causing said camera to capture an image *based on each of said detected physiological responses.* (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Terunuma* fails to disclose at least the features of claim 25 highlighted hereinabove. Therefore, the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.



### **Claims 26, 27, and 29**

Claims 26, 27, and 29 presently stand rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by *Terunuma*. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claims 26, 27, and 29 contain all features of their respective independent claim 25. Since claim 25 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 26, 27, and 29 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, these dependent claims recite patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make them allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of their base claim 25.

### **Claim 30**

Claim 30 has been added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claim 30 contains all features of its respective independent claim 2. Since claim 2 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 30 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, this dependent claim recites patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make it allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of its base claim 2.

### Claim 31

Claim 31 has been added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claim 31 contains all features of its respective independent claim 10. Since claim 10 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 31 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, this dependent claim recites patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make it allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of its base claim 10.

### Claim 32

Claim 32 has been added via the amendments set forth herein. Claim 32 reads as follows:

32. A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising;  
a contact lens;  
a photodetector coupled to said contact lens, said photodetector configured to detect a physiological response of said user and to transmit, in response to a detection of said physiological response, a signal indicative of said physiological response; and  
a controller configured to receive said signal and to control an electronic device based on said signal.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to disclose each of the features of claim 32 recited above. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claim 32 is allowable.

### Claim 33

Claim 33 has been added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claim 33 contains all features of its respective independent claim 32. Since claim 32 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 33 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed.



Cir. 1988). Furthermore, this dependent claim recites patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make it allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of its base claim 32.

#### Claim 34

Claim 34 has been added via the amendments set forth herein. Claim 34 reads as follows:

34. A method for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:
  - receiving light via a photodetector coupled to a contact lens;
  - detecting a physiological response of a user wearing said contact lens based on said light; and
  - automatically controlling an electronic device based on said detecting step.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to disclose at least the features of claim 34 recited above. Therefore, Applicants assert that claim 34 is allowable.

#### Claim 35

Claim 35 has been added via the amendments set forth herein. Applicant submits that the pending dependent claim 35 contains all features of its respective independent claim 34. Since claim 34 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 35 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, this dependent claim recites patentably distinct features and/or combinations of features that make it allowable, notwithstanding the allowability of its base claim 34.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 13, 23, and 28 have been indicated as allowable by the outstanding Office Action if rewritten to include the limitations of their respective base claims. Accordingly, pending claims 13, 23, and 28 have been amended herein to include the features of their respective base claims 12, 20, and 25, and Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 13, 23, and 28 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted ,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER  
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By:

  
Jon E. Holland  
Reg. No. 41,077

100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.  
Suite 1750  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500

**ANNOTATED VERSION OF MODIFIED CLAIMS**

**TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

The following is a marked up version of the amended claims, wherein brackets denoted deletions and underlining denotes additions.

1. (Once Amended) A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:

a plurality of sensors positioned adjacent to an eye of a user, said sensors configured to detect a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user and to transmit, in response to [a] detections of said physiological responses by said sensors, [a] signals indicative of said physiological responses; and

a controller configured to receive said signals and to [control an electronic device based on said signal] trigger an electronic device to perform a particular task based on whether each of said plurality of detected physiological responses occurs during a particular time period.

2. (Once Amended) [The system of claim 1, wherein said controller is configured] A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising: a plurality of sensors positioned adjacent to an eye of a user, said sensors configured to detect a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user and to transmit, in response to detections of said physiological responses by said sensors, signals indicative of said physiological responses, each of said signals indicative of a different one of said physiological responses; and

a controller configured to receive said signals and to determine a value indicative of an excitement level of said user based on each of said signals, said controller further configured [and] to control [said] an electronic device based on said value.

3. (Once Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein one of said physiological responses is a blink of an eyelid of said user.

5. (Once Amended) The system of claim [4] 1, wherein said physiological responses are [is] indicative of an excitement level of said user.

6. (Once Amended) The system of claim 1, further comprising a contact lens coupled to one of said sensors.

8. (Once Amended) The system of claim [1] 6, further comprising an antenna coupled to said contact lens.

9. (Once Amended) The system of claim 8, wherein said one sensor is configured to transmit one of said signals to said controller via said antenna.

10. (Once Amended) [The system of claim 1,] A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:

a sensor positioned adjacent to an eye of a user, said sensor configured to detect a physiological response of said user and to transmit, in response to a detection of said physiological response, a signal indicative of said physiological response; and  
a controller configured to receive said signal and to control an electronic device based on said signal,

wherein said sensor comprises a switch that is positioned within a path of movement of an eyelid of said user, said switch activated when said user blinks said eyelid.

12. (Once Amended) A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:

a contact lens;  
a plurality of sensors coupled to said contact lens, said sensors configured to detect a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user and to transmit, in response to [a] detections of said physiological responses, [a] signals indicative of said physiological responses; and

a controller configured to receive said signals and to [control an electronic device based on said signal] trigger an electronic device to perform a particular task based on whether each of said plurality of detected physiological responses occurs during a specified time period.

13. (Once Amended) [The system of claim 12, wherein said electronic device is a] A system for controlling cameras based on physiological responses, comprising:  
a contact lens;  
a sensor coupled to said contact lens, said sensor configured to detect a physiological response of said user and to transmit, in response to a detection of said physiological response, a signal indicative of said physiological response; and  
a controller configured to receive said signal and to control a camera based on said signal.

14. (Once Amended) [The system of claim 12,] A system for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising:  
a contact lens;  
a sensor coupled to said contact lens, said sensor configured to detect a physiological response of said user and to transmit, in response to a detection of said physiological response, a signal indicative of said physiological response; and  
a controller configured to receive said signal and to control an electronic device based on said signal,

wherein said sensor comprises a switch that is positioned within a path of movement of an eyelid of said user, said switch activated when said user blinks said eyelid.

15. (Once Amended) A method for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:

positioning a plurality of sensors adjacent to an eye of a user;  
detecting, via said sensors, a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user; [and]  
determining whether each of said different involuntary physiological responses is detected, via said detecting step, within a particular time period; and  
automatically [controlling] triggering an electronic device to perform a particular task  
based on said [detecting] determining step.

16. (Once Amended) [The method of claim 15,] A method for controlling cameras based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:

positioning a sensor adjacent to an eye of a user;  
detecting, via said sensor, a physiological response of said user; and  
automatically controlling a camera based on said detecting step,  
wherein said sensor is coupled to a contact lens.

17. (Once Amended) The method of claim 15, further comprising the step of counting, via at least one of said sensors, a number of eye blinks performed by said user within a specified time period, wherein said controlling step is based on said counting step.

18. (Once Amended) [The method of claim 15, further comprising the steps of:] A method for controlling electronic devices based on physiological responses, comprising the steps of:

positioning a plurality of sensors adjacent to an eye of a user;  
detecting, via said sensors, a plurality of different involuntary physiological responses of said user;  
determining a value indicative of an excitement level of said user based on each of said different involuntary responses detected via said [based on said] detecting step,  
automatically controlling an electronic device [wherein said controlling step is] based on said value determined in said determining step.

20. (Once Amended) A system, comprising:  
a camera;  
a plurality of sensors, each of said sensors configured to detect a different physiological response of a user; and  
a controller configured to cause said camera to capture an image based on [a] detections of [said] different physiological responses by each of said sensors.

21. (Once Amended) The system of claim 20, wherein at least one of said physiological responses is involuntary.

22. (Once Amended) The system of claim 20, wherein said controller is further configured to determine a value indicative of an excitement level of said user based on [said] detections by each of said sensors and to cause said camera to capture said image based on said value.

23. (Once Amended) [The system of claim 20, further comprising] A system, comprising:

a camera;  
a sensor configured to detect a physiological response of a user;  
a contact lens coupled to said sensor; and  
a controller configured to cause said camera to capture an image based on a detection of said physiological response by said sensor.

24. (Once Amended) The system of claim 20, wherein one of said physiological responses is a blink of an eyelid of said user.

25. (Once Amended) A method, comprising the steps of:  
providing a camera;  
detecting, via a plurality of sensors, [a] different physiological responses of a user of said camera; and  
automatically causing said camera to capture an image based on [said detecting step] each of said detected physiological responses.

26. (Once Amended) The method of claim 25, wherein at least one of said physiological responses is involuntary.

27. (Once Amended) The method of claim 26, further comprising the step of determining, based on [said detecting step] each of said detected physiological responses, a value indicative of an excitement level of said user, wherein said causing step is performed based on said value.

28. (Once Amended) [The method of claim 25,] A method, comprising the steps of:  
providing a camera;  
detecting a physiological response of a user of said camera; and  
automatically causing said camera to capture an image based on said detecting step,  
wherein said detecting step is performed by a sensor coupled to a contact lens.

29. (Once Amended) The method of claim 25, wherein one of said physiological responses is a blink of an eyelid of said user.